

THE
CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 317.]

MAY, 1828.

[NO. V.
VOL. XXVIII.]

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE EFFECTS OF PHYSICAL TEMPERAMENT ON THE EXPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS FEELING.

IT must have occurred to every attentive observer to remark, that not only is there much difference in the mode of expression of religious feeling among Christians, but also that this expression is, in a considerable degree, characterized by physical temperament, and by other analogous circumstances, as disease, exhaustion, and debility. I am not, however, aware that the subject has received the consideration which its importance deserves; and I think that an attempt to develop it, in some of its most remarkable results, will not be destitute either of interest or practical utility. At the same time, I feel that it requires a very candid and unprejudiced attention to view it in its true bearings; for, though all persons allow that the mind and body act and react upon each other, and are prepared to admit, in general terms, the propositions above announced, few, perhaps, have considered the *extent* to which the principle applies. The idea that devotional fervour or depression (I speak not of the spiritual principle, but only of the animal expression,) may sometimes be more rationally accounted for by a reference to the state of the head than of the heart, may seem to many persons to in-

volve the dangerous innovation of making a man's religious condition depend upon his *organization*; and the destruction of moral obligation which would follow from such an admission must justly excite alarm in the mind of every Christian.

But it will be seen, by a little reflection, that it is not *religion*, or the duties that flow from it, which are supposed to be influenced by any physical state, but merely the mode of expressing *the feelings*; and to assert, that, in this particular, man is independent of his temperament, and of other external circumstances, would plunge us into a labyrinth of difficulty, which would terminate either in the torrid meridian of enthusiasm, or the chilly night of the most gloomy scepticism. In order, therefore, that misconception may be obviated, and mistaken apprehensions allayed, it will, perhaps, be desirable to state the principles upon which the following observations are founded.

It is clear, then, in the first place, that there is a unity and simplicity in the spirit of man—that immortal principle, of the essence of which nothing is known; but which, as it is not an attribute of *organization*, and is essentially distinct from it; as it is destined to be the medium of communication between man and his Maker; and as it will survive the wreck of the beautiful but frail tenement it inhabits, must be something essentially distinct from matter. It is the gift of God, and

MR. BUGG ON SCRIPTURAL AND
MODERN GEOLOGY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

IN proceeding with my remarks upon the paper of Oxoniensis Alter, I come to the proposition, that "physical facts" "speak for themselves" in proof of the system of modern geology. I assume that this proposition is included in his words, when he says "such books as—Mr. Bugg's—are displayed by scientific infidels in triumph, as proofs that believers are afraid of allowing physical facts fairly to speak for themselves, lest they should oppose certain opinions which, however commonly entertained without investigation, are not the declarations of Scripture."

Our Oxford friend seems to have written a little unguardedly when he speaks of the opinions opposed to modern geology, as not being the declarations of Scripture. That they are contained in the plainest and most express "declarations" of Scripture, is certain; whether they convey the true meaning of Scripture, is a subject for inquiry. And a very interesting and important inquiry it is; especially if Oxoniensis Alter is correct in what he states respecting the increasing numbers of those who are entering upon an investigation of it. In addition to what Oxoniensis Alter states, I happen to know that it stands as a subject for discussion in a clerical meeting, shortly to be held; at which, though in a retired part of the country, between twenty and thirty clergymen will probably be present. But respecting the declarations of Scripture, I have said sufficient till some satisfactory answer shall have been given to what has already been advanced.

The point now to be investigated is, whether "physical facts" speak to the truth of the modern system of geology. I am fearful of trespassing too much on your pages,

and shall therefore touch upon the subject very briefly, endeavouring to prove, first, that modern geology is not in possession of the evidence of facts to prove its verity; next, that the evidence which is adduced is positive proof of its error; and thirdly, that it is physically impossible that the modern theory can be true.

1. *Modern geology is not in possession of the evidence of facts to prove its verity.* In proof of this, I shall adduce facts, as such, from geologists themselves; and also admissions from their own statements. Modern geologists generally have taken the theory of Baron Cuvier, as he himself has given it, upon the assumed knowledge of the facts on which it is founded. But when the case comes to be examined into, we find that M. Cuvier himself is not, upon the most liberal allowance, in possession of authentic and certain information, of more than one part in twenty millions of the fossil strata on the surface of the globe; and yet upon this pittance, this mere atom, of evidence he has raised a "theory of the earth," and we have received it at his hands. Nor is this defect all. His own personal defect of examination of the fossil strata, upon which strata the whole system rests, is not supplied by good and sufficient information from others. His own acknowledgment upon this point is remarkable. "It must not, however," says he, "be thought that this classification of the mineral repositories is as certain as that of the species, and that it has nearly the same character of demonstration. It has been impossible for me, personally, to examine the places in which these bones were found. Indeed, I have often been reduced to the necessity of satisfying myself with vague and ambiguous accounts, given by persons who did not know well what was necessary to be noticed; and I have still more frequently been unable to procure any information whatever upon the subject." (*Theory of the Earth*, 4th

edition, pp. 111, 112.) Again, he adds, "These mineral repositories are subject to infinitely greater doubt, in regard to their successive formations, than are the fossil bones respecting their arrangement and determination." "The true character of these repositories has almost always been overlooked or misunderstood." (pp. 112, 113.)

The intelligent reader needs not be reminded that the very foundation-stone of the modern system of geology lies in the assumed knowledge of the situation of the fossils in the strata, that they are free from intermixtures, and that "successive formations" are distinctly and clearly discovered. But we see that all this is a fallacy. The above admissions of Baron Cuvier shew that their situation is almost wholly unknown; and that the "successive formations" (which are the soul of the system) "are subject to infinitely greater doubt" than their situation. The system, therefore, instead of being built upon "physical facts," which "speak for themselves," is built almost entirely on the imagination of its authors, and upon no better foundation.

2. But again, *the evidence which is adduced is positive proof of its error.* On this subject I need not adduce one proof in twenty. A single instance is destructive of the theory. The theory positively and entirely rests upon the assumed fact that there are no intermixtures among the fossil remains in the respective strata. But the fact, as recorded by geologists themselves, is, that there are intermixtures every where. M. Cuvier himself acknowledges that there are some "lost species" among the "extinct genera." But the fossil *Roe* of Orleans is an instance of the "existing species" along with the most "ancient genera;" a "human jaw" is found among the ancient fossils; human bones are discovered in a stone quarry eight feet below those of an extinct rhinoceros; wrought

pillars and workmen's tools, under ten strata of limestone, along with shells; extinct animals and man in peat bogs; and extinct elephant and rhinoceros in the ice of the last deluge; the whole system of mixtures of all descriptions in Mount Bolca; and especially the celebrated human skeleton in the British museum, brought from Guadeloupe, enveloped in a compact hard limestone rock. The evidence of all this, and a great deal more, is brought forward and substantiated in the first volume of my Scriptural Geology, pp. 230—312, from M. Cuvier, Professor Jameson, Dr. Buckland, Dr. MacCulloch, the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Webster, Mr. W. Lawry, and other geologists. That work contains a body of evidence, derived from numerous facts recorded by geologists themselves, every one of which is ruinous to the theory.

3. Independently of the want of evidence in favour of the modern system of geology, and of the infallible evidence which utterly subverts it, *it is physically impossible the modern theory can be true.* When I say "impossible," I mean, of course, impossible according to the physical operations of nature, or from analogy, which is our only ground of judging what can and what cannot be. Miracles cannot be resorted to by geologists in proof of any thing; and yet every geological revolution is nothing less than a miracle; for, by the acknowledgment of M. Cuvier himself, there are not now any powers in nature which can produce similar effects; the powers assumed are occult, secret, miraculous. The re-production of new species of animals after the destruction of the former species by each revolution, is a creation—a miracle. Or, if the "new species came from some other part of the globe," and have survived the revolutions, they are no longer *new* but "ancient species;" and so, turn which way you

will, the system dies by the evidence of fact.

But the theory is physically absurd. It is a first principle in this theory that the earth was deposited in a fluid, the sea. Now allowing the sea to be upon an average half a mile in depth, it would, according to Buffon, give about sixty-four millions of cubic miles. But the solid contents of the earth amount to more than two hundred and fifty thousand millions of solid miles; a mass of matter, this, from two to twenty times their *specific gravity*, and between three and four thousand times the bulk of the waters which held this mass in suspension; namely, about ten thousand times their own weight.

Oxoniensis Alter says Mr. Bugg cannot "deny the enormous depth of fossil remains;—Mr. Buckland says, in strata two miles deep." The greater the depth, however, the greater the difficulty to modern geology. Where will Oxoniensis Alter find material enough for, and water enough to, hold in suspension *two miles* in depth of limestone rock, in any basin of the sea? If only we suppose that ten parts water would suspend one part of rock, we should then require a sea twenty miles deep.

The mechanical anomalies attendant upon the formation of the strata, agreeably to the modern theory, are so numerous and extraordinary, that I feel great difficulty in selecting one out of numerous demonstrative arguments which lie before me, sufficiently short for your pages, and sufficiently explicit to be understood by the ordinary reader. Suppose we take the case of *basins*, as basins are the particular instances from which geologists profess to derive great part of their demonstrations. The chalk basin of London; for instance, is represented by Professor Buckland as containing seven distinct deposits, amounting to the depth of 2942 feet; the lowest of which, called "plastic clay," is 1131 feet. Now, what must have been the depth of water necessary

to hold such a mass in suspension? If only, as above, we allow one in ten, the water would be more than eleven thousand feet deep, and consequently the walls of this basin more than eleven thousand feet in height; a height more than eleven times as great as the highest part of the walls of the London chalk basin, above the sea.

But a most destructive feature in these deposits is their materials. Here we suppose we are contemplating clean chalk basins containing sea water, not less than two miles deep. Where now is this water to obtain an impregnation of 1131 feet of "plastic clay," or of "coarse shell limestone," which have been deposited upon these chalk bottoms. The "plastic clay" consists of "gravel, sand, and rocks." Where did the water obtain these deposits? From the chalk it could not be derived; and sea water, as such, is not a tenth part sand, clay, or gravel. Again, we have in the London basin fifty-five feet depth of London clay: whence this? Then again, between two and three hundred feet depth of "fresh water" and "marine formations:" from what are these obtained? Only contemplate three thousand feet depth of deposit, supposing one tenth part of water were deposit, it would require chalk walls thirty thousand feet, or nearly six miles high, to sustain the depth of water contained in these basins.

Besides, the several *formations* contained in these basins are supposed to have been deposited at different periods, and after different catastrophes or eruptions of the water. But this is utterly impossible; for by the first breaking down of the walls of the basin, the basin itself would be destroyed, and would be no longer a basin. Whatever therefore were afterwards deposited in that place would not be the contents of the basin which is destroyed: it would be common to the sea at large, which is totally subversive of the hypothesis, and of

every supposition connected with the modern system of basins, and of the revived notions of fossil stratification.

I forbear to say more at present; and, till some answer of a more satisfactory character than those already given, shall be afforded, I need say no more. I trust our Oxford friend will find that there is something more than the "assuming the very points in discussion," in the foregoing remarks. And unless our geologists, or their advocates, shall condescend to give my arguments a solid, philosophical, and rational answer (instead of making charges), I shall continue the assurance, and I am satisfied that sober unprejudiced minds will, and do, join with me in assurance, that *the modern geological system has no adequate evidence from facts to prove its verity; that the evidence of the facts adduced is absolutely subversive of its pretensions; and that independently of all this, the operations involved in the theory are physically impossible.*

If such writers as the Quarterly Reviewer, the Professors of Geology in our universities, and such other authors as have chosen to advocate the system of modern geology, continue to give us lectures about the Pope and Copernicus, about Hutchinson and Sir Isaac Newton, and about natural phenomena uniformly impressing the minds of geologists, instead of answering the arguments which are advanced against the geological theory; we shall henceforth have sufficient proof who they are who indeed are "afraid of allowing physical facts fairly to speak for themselves, lest they should oppose certain opinions, which, however commonly entertained without investigation [among modern advocates of geology], are not the declarations of Scripture;" and, I may add, are not the result of sober arguments, or consistent with the dictates of a sound philosophy.

For the present I must stay my

pen; but I propose to continue the subject in your next Number, with a paper on the philosophy of modern geology. I am, &c.

GEORGE BUGG.



REPLY TO MR. BUGG ON MODERN
AND SCRIPTURAL GEOLOGY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

MY friendly antagonist, Mr. Bugg, in your last Number, has evidently the cause of truth and Divine revelation at heart. I honour him for his motive; but he entirely mistakes the object of my brief paper, on which he animadverts. I have no geological theory to support: I know not, and in truth I am not very anxious to know, which theory, among several that are advanced, is most plausible: all that I stated or complained of was, that Mr. Bugg has, throughout his book, represented such writers as Professor Buckland, Mr. Bird Sumner, Mr. Faber, and hundreds of truly Christian clergymen and laymen, as setting up "modern geology" against "scriptural geology," overturning the Mosaic account of the creation, and sapping the very foundations of Divine revelation. These gentlemen find certain facts; they are driven by them to certain conclusions, and these conclusions they consider quite reconcileable with the Mosaic account. Mr. Bugg thinks otherwise, and goes on to point out various "bad effects" which must follow upon the admission of these conclusions; bad effects upon the Hindoos, and other startling results. But all this is quite beside the question: the only inquiry is, What are the facts and what the unavoidable inferences from them? all the rest—I mean not in an invidious sense—is declamation; just as the refuters of Galileo urged the "bad effects," especially the injury to the Scripture narrative, which would follow from admitting that the earth turns

round the sun, and not the sun round the earth. But Galileo might have said, "How will you account for the actual phenomena otherwise?" Mr. Faber, when his papers on the Mosaic cosmogony appeared in your pages, was argued with in precisely the same manner. His friendly castigators did not apply themselves to a solution of the geological phenomena which he had adduced; they clearly had never even considered them: but they proceeded to shew that his position about the days of creation being long periods of time was incorrect, as very possibly it was; but the facts which led him to adopt this solution they did not even touch upon. When the infidel points to the actual facts respecting the strata, and alleges that these are contradictory to the Mosaic account, it will not silence him to argue about "bad effects." Mr. Bird Sumner, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Buckland, each gives him an answer; and though their interpretations of the Mosaic account may differ, as divines differ upon various other passages of Scripture, either solution is sufficient to satisfy a candidly inquiring mind that the divinely revealed account is not, as it cannot be, inconsistent with actual facts. But Mr. Bugg's whole paper in your last Number, like his book itself, is an *argumentum ad hominem*; a warning rather than an argument; his opponent must not attempt to touch his science without exposing himself to the charge of impugning his theology. But how will Mr. Bugg refute the infidel whom such writers as the above had utterly discomfited? The infidel, as already remarked, will not be awed by his allegation of "bad effects;" he will ask, How do you reconcile *facts* with the Mosaic narrative? Let Mr. Bugg simply take the facts respecting the strata; for the convenience of your readers, let him take, for example, Mr. Faber's brief detail of them from Cuvier, already inserted in your volumes: let him

suppose himself reasoning as a man of science with an inquiring Christian, or, if he will, with an infidel; let him omit the invidious topic of "bad effects," and plainly tell us how he accounts for these facts upon *his* exposition of the infallible narrative of holy writ. It was because they really feared "bad effects," that the enlightened Christian geologists above mentioned set themselves to deprive the infidel of his argument against the Mosaic account, by shewing that the popular exposition is not of necessity the true one. I do not plead for their respective theories; I only wished to rescue the individuals from the implications in Mr. Bugg's treatise of ministering to the subversion of Scripture and the promotion of infidel opinions; whereas their object was precisely the contrary. It was because they felt deeply as Christians that they set themselves, as men of science, to answer arguments which they did not think could be enfeebled by talking of "bad effects." Mr. Bugg's treatise abounds in objections to the modern geological theories: he considers them full of difficulties, inconsistencies, and even impossibilities. But even were all this mass of objection well-founded, which I do not think it is, the matter would still rest where it was. The question is very simple: let Mr. Bugg, instead of pulling down theories, simply tell us which of the facts adduced, for example, by Mr. Faber, from Cuvier, he admits; and then how he reconciles them with *his* exposition of the first chapter of Genesis. The truth of the word of God can never suffer from an enlightened investigation of his works.

OXONIENSIS ALTER.



ON "CUI-BONO" MEN.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It is related in Boswell's Life of Johnson, of the celebrated traveller, Dr. Shaw, that he was accustomed

to say that "he hated a *cui-bono* man."—Permit me to take this anecdote as a sort of apology for a few observations, neither, I trust, unimportant in themselves, nor unsuitable to the design of your miscellany.

A *cui-bono* man, in the sense here intended, is one who either professedly or really, or both professedly and really, acts upon the principle of utility; who, throughout the general tenor of his words and actions, virtually asks himself, "What shall it profit?"

Before, however, we can determine whether a *cui-bono* man is a proper object of aversion or admiration, it will be proper to notice some of the different kinds of good which constitute the grand aim and pursuit of human beings.

In each individual, then, the "ruling passion," whatever it be, points to the species of good which is pursued. The lover of money is, in a certain sense, a *cui-bono* man; for he is habitually governed by the desire and prospect of what he accounts his chief good—what forms his main gratification. To increase his store, he "rises early, late takes rest, and eats the bread of carefulness." The same remark applies to the lover of power, fame, pleasure, or any other object which may form the particular idol before which men bow down and worship. Some there are who, not being able to come to a decision as to what is best to be pursued, remain in that miserable suspense, so emphatically described in Scripture, where "many" are represented as asking, "Who will shew us any good?" Wholly dissatisfied with their past experience, wanting an object to fill their minds and stimulate their activity, and hardly knowing in what direction to look for one, they may almost be said to be without an object of good in prospect. Yet these too, in a certain sense, are *cui-bono* men; but they ask the question ironically, as persons who should exclaim, "What is the use of doing or attempting

any thing, since nothing is to be found deserving our ardent and persevering pursuit?" This, however, implies a morbid state of mind, no less than a vicious state of heart. There is no human being, in the enjoyment of health and active power, who has not some favourite object which he prefers to every other; which excites his constant interest, and engages his principal attention.

But, after all, the grand question for every thinking man is, What is the chief good; what the grand aim and object of the truly wise? This question may be soon and satisfactorily answered. It consists in the pursuit of our highest and most durable enjoyment; of that which alone can constitute our solid and endless felicity, when earth, with all its vanities, shall have passed away. This, in the moment of serious reflection, *must* appear the chief good to every one who regards himself in the light of an immortal and accountable being. Every such person, therefore, is, or ought to be, in this sense, a *cui-bono* man; and with *him* the grand question is, "What is the tendency of any particular action, or line of conduct, as it bears upon my moral and religious improvement, and my spiritual and eternal welfare?"

Now such a man, far from deserving to be "hated," is assuredly of all men most to be esteemed, loved, and honoured. This will appear, if we consider what good qualities the habitual operation of such a principle implies.

It implies a spirit of *sincere piety*. One, who is governed by the above-named consideration, must be a man of piety. He knows that the fear and love of God are necessary for glorifying him on earth, and enjoying his presence in heaven. He knows that these principles are the foundation of all true religion in the soul, and his only criterion for ascertaining whether he is in "the good and the right way." He cannot therefore rest satisfied, till he finds

within him some clear evidence of the predominance of these principles. To maintain and fortify them, he attends, with conscientious diligence, on the ordinances of grace and salvation. His piety necessarily increases with his religious vigilance in this respect, and brings with it a present reward in pure and elevated feelings of delight, and in the humble hope of that future and final happiness which constitutes his proper good; the paramount object of his choice, pursuit, and carefulness.

The habitual operation of the principle under review implies, also, a spirit of *self-discipline*. The service of God, and true communion with him, require vigilance against the power of temptation, and the subjugation of all sinful and inordinate affections to "the obedience of Christ." They call, likewise, for particular attention to that quarter whence, from constitutional or characteristic weakness, most danger is to be apprehended. In the exhortation to "lay aside every weight," or clog to our spiritual advancement, we are instructed to lend our chief efforts against "the sin which easily besets us." Such is the nature of religious self-discipline, which all who are governed by the desire and pursuit of "the chief end of man"—his "whole duty"—his truest dignity here, and the path through the free mercy of God in Christ to happiness hereafter, cannot fail to practise. Knowing that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," and finding, moreover, the real happiness of their renewed nature in the service of God, they, as "strangers and pilgrims upon earth," would abstain both from those "fleshy lusts," and from those evil tempers, which alike "war against the soul."

But the *cui-bono* man, in the sense here intended, must be likewise a man of *active benevolence*. He knows that the ramparts of the heavenly city are not to be scaled without activity and enterprize,

as well as watchfulness; that, he can neither go backward, nor be stationary, with safety, but should be found advancing continually in "every good word and work." Loving God, he loves his brother also; he lays himself out to become, according to his power, a useful member of society;—useful in the best and highest sense. In his domestic and social relations; as a husband, a parent, a child, a relative, a friend or acquaintance, a member of the commonwealth, a soldier of the church militant; he is anxious to perform his allotted task, and to discharge his obvious duties. His *cui-bono* principle operates at once to stimulate, and to direct his exertions.

It operates, I say, to give a right direction to his exertions; for the steady influence of this principle implies something more still than has yet been noticed. It supposes a man to be, not a Christian only, but, generally speaking, an *intelligent, well-informed, and consistent servant of Christ*. This is a point of much importance. Many good men there are, who, from neglecting to cultivate a due spirit of reflection as to the best development of their piety and beneficence, lose much of the ornament, and more of the profit, connected with these high and holy qualities. They are like a general who, while he occupies a commanding position, knows not how adequately to improve it; and who, though he may eventually conquer, loses some material advantages through his defect of skill and sagacity. Now the *cui-bono* principle, when once deeply impressed upon the mind of a good man, has wonderful efficacy in rendering his force available for the purposes for which he wishes to employ it. The predominance of this principle supposes a spirit of reflection, which leads him to seek the best information, and enables him to see his way clearly; to steer in the middle path, not of a timid or time-serving policy, but of a wise and Christian

moderation, avoiding those opposite shoals and whirlpools which endanger the course of equally well-intentioned, but less thinking and less prudent, characters.

Is then the *cui-bono* man, in this sense of the expression, a person to be "hated" or despised? Is he not rather a character to be loved, esteemed, honoured, and imitated? As Joab wished that the subjects of his master, David, were "an hundred times so many more" than they were, is it not be desired that the number of such individuals as I have described were continually increased and multiplied?

But I do not mean to reflect upon Dr. Shaw for his remark, which, as I have stated, I have taken up chiefly as an introduction for my own observations. This intelligent traveller doubtless proposed to himself, in his journeys, what he considered good and worthy objects; and thus evinced himself to be practically a *cui-bono* man. But, perhaps he intended to condemn the ostentatious pedantry of those who have the *cui bono* perpetually on their lips. He must often have remarked that the man who cannot act for the welfare of himself and others without frequently telling people that he does so, is in danger of defeating his own usefulness, or at least losing more than he gains. Besides, as a great boaster is seldom a good performer, so one who is continually prating about the *cui bono* is not the person most likely to be governed by the principle which it expresses. Or again, Dr. Shaw might mean to express his disapprobation of that extreme caution or timidity which are among the greatest impediments to usefulness; because they keep a man from bestirring himself in any course of action, till he is completely satisfied of its being open to no objections. Now this is a refinement in prudence; a morbid excess of caution greatly to be condemned. The state of the world, and the course of events,

hardly admit of it, consistently with a proper attention to the great ends and duties of life. Our time, at the longest, is short; and this, though no ground for thoughtless haste or unreflecting activity, forms a powerful reason for constant industry and diligence. In debating what is best to be done, we may sometimes let slip altogether the season for action: as a commander, who refused to fight till he had sent to a distance to consult the oracle, might find, before the return of his messenger, that he had placed himself at the mercy of the enemy, or at least that the enemy had escaped him. Providence, in placing before us opportunities for action, often calls us to arise and be *doing*, without stopping too nicely to balance every minute counter-consideration. The consequences of any particular course of action are indeed to be previously estimated, according to their importance; but, since "probability," as Bishop Butler truly remarks, "is the very guide of life," we are not to sit with our hands before us, till every *possible* objection shall be removed. If we do so, we shall end with attempting nothing, and may incur the guilt and punishment of the servant who kept his talent in a napkin, and restored it without increase. In this view of the *cui-bono* man, therefore, Dr. Shaw was certainly in the right.

But perhaps we shall come the nearest to Dr. Shaw's meaning, if we suppose him intending much the same as Burke when he complained that the age of chivalry had passed away. He might intend to express his dislike of a cold, phlegmatic, so-called utilitarian, whose whole idea of utility is bounded by matters of sordid frigid calculation; who has no soul for any lofty or generous impulse; who asks what poetry proves; what religion will fetch in the market; what is the use of spending public money either on new churches or the British museum, as the case may happen; who measures good by bales of cotton

and hanks of yarn; who values twenty happy families and all the benignities and charities, the duties and enjoyments, which arise out of their intercourse, as about the equivalent for one fifty-horse steam-engine; who revels in Smith and Ricardo, Macculloch and the Westminster Review, but never opens Cowper or Milton; who has ample patience for Mr. Hume or Mr. Wilmot Horton, but cannot listen to Mr. Wilberforce; who calculates the good and evil of slavery by his ledger instead of the Decalogue, and thinks nothing of the trifling matter of feeling and humanity, or even of life and limb, except as they affect property; the man, in short, who has "no music in his soul," who never gives, never sympathizes, never smiles, never weeps; a mere iron poker endued with the power of reasoning, and bounding all his reasoning with those demonstrations which fall short of whatever is proveable only on the grounds of morals, religion, and true sensibility of heart.

I will not attempt to shield characters like these from Dr. Shaw's odium; but still I think his maxim so unguardedly expressed as to be dangerous. The gay, the idle, the romantic, the novel reader, the whole train of moral butterflies will fasten on it, to ridicule every sober judicious Christian. They do not wish to be pestered for ever with the *cui bono* of their doings; they *feel* they are good—they love them—and that is enough. And this is to pass current as an efficient proxy for sense, and reason, and religion. In spite then of Dr. Shaw, I would prefer, whether in business or religion, the *true* *cui-bonist*; for though the command of God is, "My son, give me thy heart," it is not till we are led to estimate aright the utility and blessedness of this self-dedication that we ever learn to practice it.

I will conclude this paper with enforcing the *cui-bono* principle, as it is applied to the most impor-

tant of subjects, urged by the very highest authority, and addressed to all mankind without exception. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

F.

SUPERSTITION IS NOT PIETY.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It must have occurred to every observant mind to remark how much easier it is to be superstitious than pious. An obvious instance of this is observable in the terrors which many irreligious persons shew in a thunder storm; and I fear that some truly religious persons really make a merit of countenancing such superstitions. Can we indeed wonder that an uneducated ignorant mother says to her child, as I have heard scores of times, "Are you not afraid of the thunder? God might strike you dead for daring to look at the lightning," when even a highly cultivated, a professedly philosophical writer like Bishop Horne can say (Psalm xviii.), "Storms and tempests in the element of air are instruments of the Divine displeasure.... every thunder storm which we behold should remind us of that exhibition of power and vengeance which is expected hereafter to accompany the general resurrection." I hold this to be — I will not say unphilosophical but—unscriptural. Storms and tempests are to the full as much instruments of benefit as of "displeasure." Woe to the child whose parent does not stop short when he comes to a passage like this; or rather does not at once inculcate the direct contrary sentiment. "No—my child—God is love. These external tokens of his power are designed to carry on the operations of the material world which he has made. I will explain to you the natural causes of thunder and lightning: do not view them